THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1911

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, California, Maryland, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-nine Branch Committees; 15,317[a] members in 299 cities, towns, and villages.

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

[a] Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the state.

FOR WHOSE SAKE?

MEMBERS of any of the various legislatures who may be importuned this winter to vote in favor of woman suffrage measures may well ask themselves "for whose sake shall such votes be cast?"

Not certainly for the sake of the small but clamorous minority of women who make the demand. In everything else the principle that the wishes of the majority should be respected prevails, and it should prevail here. It is not the pitiful two or three per cent of women who use the school ballot when it is given them, nor the pitiful four per cent of Massachusetts women who, when they had the chance, in 1895, declared that they wanted the municipal ballot, but the more than 95 per cent of women who do not want the ballot, whose wishes should be heeded.

But it is surely not for the sake of women as a whole that suffrage measures should be enacted. If most of them do not want the ballot, to thrust it upon them would be to impose on them an unwelcome and unnecessary burden. Such a proceeding could be justified, if at all, only by the existence of some grave public necessity which could be met in no other way.

It is equally certain that it is not for the sake of the public at large that woman suffrage measures should be passed. Women's votes can help the public at large only if they are cast, on the whole, more steadily, more intelligently, more unselfishly than those of men. But it would be inevitable that women, not wanting the ballot, untrained in its use, and unfamiliar with many of the questions depending upon it, would vote on the whole more capriciously, less intelligently and probably no more unselfishly than men. The public interests must suffer accordingly.

THE FIFTH DEFEAT IN OREGON.

AT the election on November 8, a proposed woman suffrage amendment to the constitution of Oregon was defeated by a vote of 35,270 in favor to 59,065 opposed, an adverse majority of 23,795.

This is the fifth time that the voters of Oregon have refused to incorporate woman suffrage in their constitution. The first time that the question was submitted was in 1884. Suffrage was then defeated by a majority of 16,953 in a total vote of only 39,399. This defeat was so decisive that, when the question was next submitted, in 1900, the voters apparently were unable to take it seriously, and the suffragists came near carrying the amendment, the majority against them being only 2,137. That year, however, was the last of any indecision on the part of the Oregon voters. The question came up again in 1906, under the initiative-referendum. The affirmative vote was 36,902, the negative vote 47,075, a majority of 10,173 against the proposal. In 1908, the question was submitted for the fourth time, again under the initiative-referendum, and in exactly the same form as before. By this time, the voters began to manifest impatience with these repeated appeals over an issue so recently settled. The affirmative vote fell off slightly, from 36,902 to 36,858; and the negative vote rose from 47,075 to 58,670, and the adverse majority from 10,173 to 21,812.

On November 8 last, the adverse majority was heavier than at any of the previous elections. Looking back over the last three attempts, the Oregon suffragists contemplate an affirmative vote smaller in 1908 than in 1906, and smaller in 1910 than in 1908; and an adverse majority in 1908 more than twice as large as in 1906, and in 1910 nearly 2,000 larger than in 1908. Yet they declare their purpose to submit the question again in 1912. If they do, the voters of Oregon will know what to do with it.

IN THE NEW STATES.

THE suffragists were prompt in laying siege to the constitutional conventions engaged in framing constitutions for the new states of New Mexico and Arizona. In New Mex-

ico, all that they were able to extort from the convention was a provision for school suffrage, a privilege already granted to women in most of the older states and so little exercised as to be almost a negligible factor.

In Arizona, the suffragists maintained a lobby from the day of the opening of the convention. They tried to secure the submission of woman suffrage as a separate question at the same time with the constitution. Failing in that, they tried to persuade the convention to make it mandatory upon the first legislature to call a special election at which a vote might be taken upon the question. But the convention, by a vote of 28 to 12, refused to impose any such requirement upon the legislature.

THREE SOUND REASONS.

THERE are three sound reasons on which women who are opposed to woman suffrage ground their opposition.

First, they believe that to give women the ballot would be mischievous to society, and mischievous to their sex; mischievous to society, which must bear the consequences of giving responsibility to an untrained electorate; mischievous to their sex, because the suffrage movement, instead of being a movement of progress, confuses the functions of men and women, and proposes to add new and heavy responsibilities to those which women already bear.

Second, they believe that to give the ballot to women, so far from improving the condition of women, would restrict and diminish their influence. The very secret of the large and helpful influence which women now exert in social and public questions lies in the fact that it is wholly separated from politics, and wholly disinterested.

Third, they believe that the work of women for the state and their responsibilities toward it must always differ essentially from those of men, and that, therefore, their share of the working of the state machinery should be different from that of men.

These arguments have been urged many times, and they never have been answered. At the risk of repetition, THE REMONSTRANCE urges them anew upon members of legislatures who, perhaps for the first time, are called upon this year to give a direct answer to the question whether women shall be given the ballot.

A SURPRISING STATEMENT.

THE Woman's Journal of November 26, referring to the change which was made in the form of the amendment proposed in Oregon, said:

Not long before election it was found that, either by an accident or by the work of the enemy, the form of the amendment which the women intended to submit this year had been changed in the printing, and had been made an amendment for full suffrage. The accusation of the Antis that the change was a trick on the part of the suffragists is preposterous. The change placed them at a distinct disadvantage, but they had to make the best of it.

From the suffrage point of view there can be no better authority as to what occurred in Oregon than Mrs. Duniway, President of the Oregon State Equal Suffrage Association. Over her own signature, in the Portland Telegram of July 27, Mrs. Duniway gave the following account of it:

Recently the title chosen for the ballot by Attorney-General Crawford was called to our attention, and not being satisfactory to our state executive committee, as it did not, in our opinion make the meaning of our petition clear, I came to Salem at the General's kindly suggestion and have this morning held a conference with him and the equally obliging Assistant Secretary of State, who, having discovered that the words "white male" had been omitted from our pending amendment, kindly eliminated the word "all" from the ballot title; and, upon showing clearly that the omission of the words "white male" from the constitution *will not only allow all women to vote*, if our amendment is adopted, but will enable men to eliminate the words "white male" from the state constitution, and thus place it in harmony with the Constitution of the United States, *we gladly accepted the omission as providential.*

From this it appears that the juggling with the form of the Oregon amendment, so far from being either an "accident" or "the work of an enemy" was something in which Mrs. Duniway herself had a hand, and which she gladly accepted as "providential." Moreover, The Woman's Journal itself, in its issue for August 20, quoted Mrs. Duniway as saying that "the omission of the tax-paying qualification will allay the hostility that was developing on the part of the labor unions, and will win the support at the polls of many who objected to the more limited measure."

It seems rather late now to ascribe to some unknown enemy a transaction which was so joyously admitted by Mrs. Duniway last July.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE.

THE exultation of the suffragists over the ratification of the woman suffrage amendment to the constitution of the state of Washington at the election on November 8, may seem somewhat excessive and effusive. But it is natural enough, in view of the fact that this is the first victory of any importance which the suffrage cause has won since 1896. When a body of agitators has waited fourteen years for a victory, it may be expected to be exuberant when a victory comes. The result in Washington falls into its proper place when it is remembered that, of four states which voted upon proposed woman suffrage amendments on November 8, Washington is the only one in which the vote was in the affirmative. This suggests a preponderance of three to one against suffrage. The election in Washington re-emphasizes the importance of bringing out and organizing the latent anti-suffrage sentiment of women in all the states, and especially in those in which the issue is directly raised. Nothing is better calculated to deter legislators or voters from precipitate action

than the expression of the views of the large majority of women who do not want the ballot.

APROPOS of this lesson of the need of a thorough organization of women opposed to woman suffrage, it is a matter for heartfelt congratulation that a strong anti-suffrage organization has recently been formed in Southern California. It bears the name of the "Southern California Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage" and it has for its President Mrs. George A. Caswell; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry T. Lee, Mrs. Marshall Wotkyns of Pasadena, Mrs. A. G. L. Trew, Mrs. Joseph Mesmer, Mrs. Cameron E. Thom, Mrs. Walter Hughes, Mrs. J. B. Lippincott, Mrs. Josephine Butler, Miss Anna Maichel, and Mrs. M. J. Connell; Treasurer, Mrs. Jonathan R. Scott of Los Angeles; Secretary, Mrs. George L. Fischer; and an Executive Committee of twenty. It is also a matter for congratulation that this Association and that of Rhode Island have announced their intention of joining the Federation of State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

THE complete official returns of the vote in the three states which rejected woman suffrage amendments at the elections last November, as procured for THE REMONSTRANCE from the offices of the secretaries of state, are as follows:

	For	Against
Oregon	35,270	59,065
Oklahoma	88,808	128,928
South Dakota	35,290	57,709

These adverse majorities, amounting in all to 86,334, afford little encouragement for the suffragists.

IN another column, an account is given, from the press despatches, of the demonstrations of the "militant suffragettes" in London last November. Such occurrences are calculated to make all true friends of woman's progress grieve; and it can give no satisfaction to women organized to oppose woman suffrage to have to record them. The field of fair debate is wide enough, and the issues involved in this question are momentous enough without the intrusion of such episodes. But these incidents are instructive, as showing the real trend of the woman suffrage movement. "Militancy" in the suffrage movement is only another name for disorder and lawlessness, for impatience with all restraint, for the substitution of some sort of physical demonstration for reason and argument. From hissing the President of the United States to striking the Prime Minister of Great Britain and Ireland is not so very long a step. Both proceedings, whether merely hysterical or the outcome of a deliberately-adopted policy, betray an infirmity of judgment which must needs be taken account of when the women concerned in them insist that "votes for women" are essential to just and good government.

IN all such demonstrations, nothing is clearer than that the women engaged in them, while using the weapons of men, and conducting themselves like male disturbers of the peace, expect the immunity of their own sex. If some British statesman, struck in the face by a militant suffragette, were to strike back, he would be charged with brutality. But how long can the militant suffragettes claim the rights of both sexes? When they resort to mob violence, can they expect to be treated with chivalrous respect? So far, the London police have used very different means in dispersing suffragette mobs from those which they would employ with any other class of rioters. But it cannot be expected that women can go on indefinitely acting like hooligans without being treated somewhat after the manner of hooligans. To those who realize how largely the foundations of society rest upon the respect and deference which civilized man naturally pays to woman, it must seem an ominous symptom that these self-constituted militant leaders are so ready to forfeit their prerogatives.

A SUFFRAGETTE RIOT IN LONDON.

Mr. Asquith and Mr. Birrell Mobbed.

London, Nov. 22. — Prime Minister Asquith was assaulted by militant suffragettes in the precincts of the House of Commons today and was saved from rough handling only by the prompt arrival of a strong body of police.

One of the women hit the Premier a smart blow and when the police carried Mr. Asquith off in a taxicab, the suffragettes attempted to storm the Premier's residence, and later attacked Augustine Birrell, Chief Secretary for Ireland, as he was strolling through St. James's Park to the Athenæum Club. They swooped down upon the aged statesman, knocking his hat over his eyes and kicking him about the legs. When help came and the women were driven off, Mr. Birrell limped to his motor car, on the arms of policemen.

The rioting continued into the evening, when squads of women stoned the residences of Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary; Winston Spencer Churchill, the Home Secretary, and Lewis Harcourt, Secretary of State for the Colonies. Sir Edward Grey's house bore the brunt of the assault.

The attack on Mr. Asquith followed his announcement in the House that if he was still in power at the next session of Parliament, the Government would give facilities for the consideration of a woman's franchise bill so framed as to admit of free amendment.

This declaration, instead of placating the suffragettes, as it was intended to do, served only to inflame them with the idea that Mr. Asquith was playing with them. At a meeting at Caxton Hall, Miss Christabel Pankhurst characterized the Minister's statement as wholly unsatisfactory and "nothing more nor less than an insult to the cause." The women, she shouted, considered the Premier's attitude a declaration of war, and they would answer the challenge immediately.

No sooner said than done. With a rush the women emptied the hall, and, several hundred strong, started for Downing Street. With unexpected good fortune they encountered the Prime Minister on his way from the House. Without any preliminaries Miss Henrietta Williams struck the Government leader, at the same time crying out:

"You tax women as heavily as men, yet women are not represented in Parliament."

The Prime Minister was hustled into a taxicab. As the cab started off with a bound, Miss Williams made another attempt to reach its occupant, and in doing so put her militant fist through the glass of the cab window. She was pulled away, still crying, "Traitor!" and "Coward."

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE.

Actual Results of Woman Suffrage in Suffrage States.

WOMAN suffragists are so fluent in their promises of what will come to pass when the ballot is given to women that it is both reasonable and instructive to inquire what the actual results are in states where women have been voting for a number of years.

Mr. Richard Barry's report of conditions in the four suffrage states, published in The Ladies' Home Journal for November 1, is important for the light which it throws upon this question. Mr. Barry was sent out to study conditions as they are, and The Ladies' Home Journal was prepared to print the results of his investigations, whatever they might be.

Among the reforms most often promised by the suffragists as the result of giving women the ballot are (1) higher wages and better hours for working women; (2) reforms in child-labor laws; (3) a marked decrease in divorce, and better marriage laws, and (4) a positive regulation of the social evil.

Conditions of Woman Labor.

Under the first head, Mr. Barry mentions the fact that in twenty states where men only vote, laws have been passed limiting the hours that a woman may be employed. Not one of the suffrage states has any such law. . . . As to wages, the same inequality between the pay of men and women in the schools, in business, as clerks, stenographers, etc., is found in the suffrage states which exists in other states. Upon this point, Mr. Barry's conclusions are sustained by the facts adduced by Miss Sumner in her book on equal suffrage in Colorado, although Miss Sumner investigated the question with a strong suffrage bias.

As to Child Labor.

Mr. Barry was told by officials in the suffrage states that the question of child labor had never been discussed. It was said that such a law was not necessary any way, as there is no chance of child labor in the mountain states, where there are no factories. Yet Montana, where men only can vote, and which is as sparsely settled and as free from factories as Wyoming, Utah or Idaho, where women vote, has a constitutional amendment prohibiting the working of all children under sixteen years of age. The chief of police of Denver states that there is an alarming increase of juvenile crime in that city. In 1905 and 1906 there were 67 children committed to the Golden Industrial Home, the Colorado State Reformatory. In the following two years, 197 were committed there, an increase of three to one. In none of the suffrage states were societies found organized for the placing of destitute children.

Divorce and the Social Evil.

The statistics show that, in the four suffrage states, divorce, so far from decreasing, is increasing rapidly. During the twelve years from 1894 to 1906, the number of divorces rose in Idaho from 89 to 320, in Utah from 189 to 387, in Wyoming from 66 to 143, and in Colorado from 364 to 557. It does not appear that, in either of the four states any effort has been made by women to improve the divorce laws. As to the social evil, Mr. Barry reports:

To ascertain this condition in Denver I quote the woman who ought to be as well informed as any one in this country: Mrs. Kate Waller Barrett, National President of the Florence Crittenton Home for Wayward Girls.

"In all the seventy-eight Florence Crittenton homes in the United States I never saw such a collection of young, innocent girls of the better class as there are in the Denver home," said Mrs. Barrett. "There are fifty-eight girls there, most of them still in their teens. The number of illegitimate births among young girls is increasing at an alarming rate. So-called 'free love' is also alarmingly on the increase."

The chief of police of Denver joins with the chief of police of Salt Lake City (the only two towns of any size in the woman suffrage country) as my authority for the statement that prostitution is largely on the increase both in Colorado and in Utah. Idaho and Wyoming, being rural communities, can show a better record, but still no better than similar communities elsewhere.

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1908

In **Kansas**, a presidential suffrage bill was ruled out, and in **Rhode Island** a similar bill was killed in committee; in **Kentucky** and **Louisiana**, school suffrage bills were defeated; in **Massachusetts** a municipal suffrage bill and a tax-paying municipal suffrage were defeated, and in **Vermont** a tax-paying municipal suffrage bill; in **Michigan**, the constitutional convention rejected a proposal for full woman suffrage; in **New York**, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was killed in committee; in **Ohio**, a proposed constitutional amendment and a license suffrage bill failed in the legislature; and in **Oregon**, a proposed amendment to the constitution was rejected at the polls by an adverse majority of 21,812 as compared with 10,173 in 1906.

IN 1909

In **Arizona**, **Connecticut**, **Illinois**, **Nebraska** and **New Hampshire**, municipal suffrage bills were defeated; in **Kansas** and **Rhode Island** presidential suffrage bills were defeated; in **California**, **Iowa**, **Maine**, **Massachusetts**, **Minnesota**, **Missouri**, **Nebraska**, **New York**, and **Oklahoma**, proposed suffrage amendments to the state constitutions either failed in committee, or were defeated in one or both branches of the legislature; in **Wisconsin**, a proposal to give women full suffrage provided that it should be approved at a referendum, passed the Senate but was defeated in the Assembly; in **Connecticut** a license suffrage bill was defeated.

IN 1910

In **Arizona**, the constitutional convention refused, by a vote of more than two to one, either to submit the question of woman suffrage to the voters as a separate proposition, or to require the first legislature to call a special election at which the question might be voted on.

In **Kentucky**, a school suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 46 to 37.

In **Maryland**, a state-wide suffrage bill was defeated, and a bill to confer municipal suffrage on the women of Baltimore was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 67 to 24 in the House of Delegates.

In **Massachusetts**, a proposed constitutional amendment was adversely reported, 7 to 4, and was defeated in the House by a vote of 155 to 54, and in the Senate without a division.

In **New Mexico**, the constitutional convention refused to incorporate a woman suffrage section in the constitution.

In **New York**, the Assembly, by a vote of 87 to 46, and the Senate, by a vote of 30 to 16, refused to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of a proposed suffrage amendment, so that the question might be brought to a vote.

In **Oklahoma**, November 8, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated at the polls by a vote of 88,808 in favor to 128,928 opposed, an adverse majority of 40,120.

In **Oregon**, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated at the polls, November 8, by a vote of 35,270 in favor to 59,065 opposed, an adverse majority of 23,795; the heaviest adverse majority given at any of the five elections at which the question has been submitted since 1884.

In **Rhode Island**, an adverse report upon a presidential suffrage bill was accepted by the Senate by a vote of 33 to 3. Yet, in 1907, the Senate actually passed a similar bill and it was left to the House to defeat it.

In **South Dakota**, November 8, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated at the polls by a vote of 35,290 in favor to 57,709 opposed.

In **Vermont**, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated.